

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of March 17, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. More specifically, it was asserted that the term "computer-readable storage" lacks antecedent basis in the specification.

Although it is believed that the terms "computer-readable storage" and "machine-readable storage" are interchangeable, the term "computer-readable storage" has been changed back to "machine-readable storage" as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, it being asserted that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, it was asserted that since all the limitations are software elements (at least one computing resource, a ghost registry, and a ghost agent), the claims are directed to functional descriptive material that is not embodied on a computer system which is non-statutory.

Claim 10 has been amended to specifically recite the elements or means of the system, which can be implemented as hardware or a combination of hardware and software. Claims 11-14 have been cancelled.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, it was asserted that the phrase "said ghost agents" lacks antecedent basis and that it is unclear whether there are more than one ghost agent in the framework or at least one ghost agent.

Claim 10 has been amended and the limitation "said ghost agents" has been deleted.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-12 and 14-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,122,664 to Boukobza, *et al.* (hereinafter Boukobza) in view of U.S. Patent 6,681,243 to Putzolu, *et al.* (hereinafter Putzolu). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boukobza in view of Putzolu.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have amended the claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application by emphasizing certain aspects of the invention. However, such amendments should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 10, 16, and 25 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments. Independent Claim 15 has been cancelled.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method for restricting resources consumed by ghost agents within a domain of a grid computing environment.

The method can include identifying a host, wherein the host is a software object operating within the grid environment and movable from one grid to another grid within the grid environment; associating a ghost agent with the host, wherein the ghost agent is configured to replicate and record at least one action of the host, and wherein the ghost agent follows the movement of the associated host.

The method also can include registering the ghost agent with a ghost registry of the domain, wherein the ghost agent is de-registered when the ghost agent leaves the domain; responsive to the registering, conveying a containment policy to the ghost agent from the ghost registry, wherein the containment policy is dynamically altered when a ghost agent is registered or de-registered with the ghost registry and a update of the containment policy is broadcasted to registered ghost agents; determining a resource utilization value for the ghost agent; comparing the resource utilization value to a limit established by the containment policy; and if the limit is exceeded, preventing the ghost agent from executing at least one operation.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0008] and [0063] to [0066].

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

Boukobza discloses a process for monitoring a plurality of object types of a plurality of nodes from a manager node in a data processing system by distributing configured agents. It was asserted in paragraph 9 on page 3 of the Office Action that col. 5, lines 13-18 of Boukobza discloses an autonomous agent associated with object types or to a particular domain and col. 1, lines 33-39 of Boukobza discloses such object types

include software objects. However, after reviewing the relevant passages, it is noted that in Boukobza the autonomous agent is installed in a specific node to monitor object types associated with the node (not associated with a specific host). Putzolu discloses that each agent may move from an environment on one device to an environment on another device. However, Putzolu does not disclose the association of a ghost agent with a corresponding host and does not disclose the movement of a ghost agent following the movement of its associated host. Therefore, Boukobza in view of Putzolu does not disclose a host movable from one grid to another grid within the grid environment or a ghost agent that is associated with the host and that follows the movement of the associated host, as recited in independent Claims 1, 10, 16, and 25.

Col. 3, lines 29-39 of Boukobza describes that each autonomous agent installed in each node, in addition to certain actions the agent performs, feeds back to the management node the information to be displayed. It is not clear how this passage has anything to do with a containment policy for restricting resources consumed by ghost agents. Therefore, it is believed that Boukobza does not disclose registering the ghost agent with a ghost registry of the domain, wherein the ghost agent is de-registered when the ghost agent leaves the domain; responsive to the registering, conveying a containment policy to the ghost agent from the ghost registry, wherein the containment policy is dynamically altered when a ghost agent is registered or de-registered with the ghost registry and a update of the containment policy is broadcasted to registered ghost agents; determining a resource utilization value for the ghost agent; comparing the resource utilization value to a limit established by the containment policy; and if the limit is exceeded, preventing the ghost agent from executing at least one operation, as recited in independent Claims 1, 10, 16, and 25.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 10, 16, and 25 as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 10, 16, and 25 define over the prior

Appln No. 10/666,310
Amendment dated June 17, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2008
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0031 (400)

art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1, or 16 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: June 17, 2008

/Richard A. Hinson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188